arXiv:1407.0676v2 [math.CA] 16 Sep 2014

Generalised Cantor sets and the dimension of products

Eric J. Olson*, James C. Robinson†, and Nicholas Sharples‡

September 17, 2014

Abstract

In this paper we consider the relationship between the Assouad and box-counting dimension and how both behave under the operation of taking products. We introduce the notion of 'equi-homogeneity' of a set, which requires a uniformity in the size of local covers at all lengths and at all points. We prove that the Assouad and box-counting dimensions coincide for sets that have equal upper and lower box-counting dimensions provided that the set 'attains' these dimensions (analogous to 's-sets' when considering the Hausdorff dimension), and the set is equi-homogeneous. Using this fact we show that for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and any $\beta, \gamma \in (0,1)$ such that $\beta + \gamma \geq 1$ we can construct two generalised Cantor sets C and D such that $\dim_B C = \alpha\beta$, $\dim_B D = \alpha\gamma$, and $\dim_A C = \dim_A D = \dim_A(C \times D) = \dim_B(C \times D) = \alpha$.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the behaviour of the box-counting and Assouad dimensions (whose definitions we give below) under the action of taking the Cartesian product of sets. Relatively straightforward arguments can be used to show that the Assouad and upper box-counting dimensions satisfy

$$\dim(A \times B) \leq \dim A + \dim B,$$

but constructing examples showing that this inequality is strict is less straightforward. For the box-counting dimension, the first example of sets for which there is strict inequality was constructed by Robinson & Sharples in [14]: these are Cantor-like sets with carefully controlled ratios, much as those in this paper. A significantly simpler example involving two countable sets followed later from Olson & Robinson [11]. For the Assouad dimension, there is an example of strict inequality due to Larman [8] (see also Section 9.2 in Robinson [13]) of two subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ that accumulate at zero in such a way that the sets and their product all have dimension one.

*Mathematics and Statistics, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89507, USA. ejo@unr.edu

†Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK, CV4 7AL. j.c.robinson@warwick.ac.uk

‡Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, UK, SW7 2AZ. nicholas.sharples@gmail.com

In this paper we provide a unified treatment of the two dimensions using 'generalised Cantor sets', i.e. Cantor sets in which we allow the portion removed to vary at each stage of the construction in a controlled way. Our argument to calculate the Assouad dimension of generalised Cantor sets and their products relies on the 'equi-homogeneity' of these sets (defined below): roughly this is the property that the range of the number of balls required in the 'local covers' of the set is uniformly bounded at all length-scales. We discuss equi-homogeneity in a more general setting in [6] where we prove that the attractors of a large class of iterated function systems are equi-homogeneous. However, the arguments presented here will serve as prototypes for the more general results in [6].

1.1 Counting covers

We begin by defining some notions of dimension for subsets of a metric space (X, d_X). We adopt the notation $B_\delta(x)$ for the closed ball of radius δ with centre $x \in X$, and for brevity we refer to sets of this form as *δ-balls*. For a set $F \subset X$ and a length $\delta > 0$ we denote by $\mathcal{N}(F, \delta)$ the minimum number of δ-balls such that F is contained in their union. If $\mathcal{N}(F, \delta)$ is finite for all $\delta > 0$ we say that the set F is *totally bounded*. We recall that for each $\delta > 0$ the function $\mathcal{N}(\cdot, \delta)$ is

- monotonic, that is $A \subset B \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(A, \delta) \leq \mathcal{N}(B, \delta)$, and
- subadditive, that is $\mathcal{N}(A \cup B, \delta) \leq \mathcal{N}(A, \delta) + \mathcal{N}(B, \delta)$,

and that for each set $F \subset X$ the function $\mathcal{N}(F, \cdot)$ is non-increasing.

There are many similar geometric quantities, some of which we will make use of in what follows:

- $\mathcal{D}(F, \delta)$, the minimum number of sets of diameter δ that cover F, where the diameter of a set A is given by $\mathrm{diam}(A) = \sup\{|x - y| : x, y \in A\}$;
- $\mathcal{P}(F, \delta)$, the maximum number of disjoint δ-balls with centres in F.

It is a short exercise to establish that these geometric quantities satisfy

$$\mathcal{D}(F, 4\delta) \leq \mathcal{N}(F, 2\delta) \leq \mathcal{P}(F, \delta) \leq \mathcal{D}(F, \delta) \tag{1}$$

(see, for example, Definitions 3.1 in Falconer [4] or Lemma 2.1 in Robinson & Sharples [14]).

We adopt the cover by δ-balls as our primary measure since it is convenient for sets of the form $B_\delta(x) \cap F$, which feature in the definition of the Assouad dimension.

1.2 Box-Counting Dimension

First, we recall the definition of the familiar box-counting dimensions.

Definition 1.1. *For a totally bounded set $F \subset X$ we define the lower and upper box-counting dimensions of F as the quantities*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F := \liminf_{\delta \to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F, \delta)}{-\log \delta},$$

and

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} F := \limsup_{\delta \to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F, \delta)}{-\log \delta}$$

respectively.

In light of the inequalities (1), replacing $\mathcal{N}(F,\delta)$ with any of the geometric quantities mentioned above gives an equivalent definition. The box-counting dimensions essentially capture the exponent $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for which the minimum number of δ-balls required to cover F scales like $\mathcal{N}(F,\delta) \sim \delta^{-s}$. More precisely, it follows from Definition 1.1 that for all $\delta_0 > 0$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$C^{-1}\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F+\varepsilon} \leq \mathcal{N}(F,\delta) \leq C\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}} F-\varepsilon} \qquad \text{for all } 0 < \delta \leq \delta_0. \quad (2)$$

In some cases the bounds (2) will also hold at the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$, that is for each $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C}\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F} \leq \mathcal{N}(F,\delta) \leq C\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}} F} \qquad \text{for all } 0 < \delta \leq \delta_0, \quad (3)$$

giving precise control of the growth of $\mathcal{N}(F,\delta)$. We distinguish this class of sets in the following definition:

Definition 1.2. *We say that a bounded set $F \subset X$* attains *its lower box-counting dimension if for all $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a positive constant $C \leq 1$ such that*

$$\mathcal{N}(F,\delta) \geq C\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F} \qquad \textit{for all} \quad 0 < \delta \leq \delta_0.$$

Similarly, we say that F attains *its upper box-counting dimension if for all $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$\mathcal{N}(F,\delta) \leq C\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}} F} \qquad \textit{for all} \quad 0 < \delta \leq \delta_0.$$

We remark that a similar distinction is made with regard to the Hausdorff dimension of sets: recall that the Hausdorff measures are a one-parameter family of measures, denoted $\mathcal{H}^s$ with parameter $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and that for each set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a value $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} F \in \mathbb{R}^+$, called the Hausdorff dimension of F, such that

$$\mathcal{H}^s(F) = \begin{cases} \infty & s < \dim_{\mathrm{H}} F \\ 0 & s > \dim_{\mathrm{H}} F. \end{cases}$$

For a set F to have Hausdorff dimension d it is sufficient, but not necessary, for the Hausdorff measure with parameter d to satisfy $0 < \mathcal{H}^d(F) < \infty$. Sets with this property are sometimes called d-sets (see, for example, [4] pp.32) and are distinguished as they have many convenient properties. For example, the Hausdorff dimension product formula $\dim_{\mathrm{H}}(F \times G) \geq \dim_{\mathrm{H}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{H}} G$ was first proved for sets F and G in this restricted class (see Besicovitch & Moran [2]) before being extended to hold for all sets (see Howroyd [7]).

1.3 Homogeneity and the Assouad Dimension

The Assouad dimension is a less familiar notion of dimension, in which we are concerned with 'local' coverings of a set F: for more details see Assouad [1], Bouligand [3], Fraser [5], Luukkainen [9], Olson [10], or Robinson [13].

Definition 1.3. *A set $F \subset X$ is s-homogeneous if for all $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F, \rho) \leq C(\delta/\rho)^s \qquad \forall\, x \in F, \quad \textit{for all } \delta, \rho \textit{ with } 0 < \rho < \delta \leq \delta_0.$$

Note that we do not require a set to be totally bounded in order for it to be s-homogeneous.

Definition 1.4. *The Assouad dimension of a set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}} F := \inf\left\{s \in \mathbb{R}^+ : \ F \textit{ is s-homogeneous}\right\}$$

It is known that for a totally bounded set $F \subset X$ the three notions of dimension that we have now introduced satisfy

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F \leq \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F \leq \dim_{\mathrm{A}} F \tag{4}$$

(see, for example, Lemma 9.6 in Robinson [13] or Lemma 1.9 of [6]). An interesting example is given by the compact countable set $F_\alpha := \{n^{-\alpha}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \cup \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha > 0$ for which

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F_\alpha = \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F_\alpha = (1+\alpha)^{-1} \\ \text{but} \qquad & \dim_{\mathrm{A}} F_\alpha = 1. \end{aligned}$$

(see Olson [10] and Example 13.4 in Robinson [12]).

1.4 Product Sets

Let (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y) be metric spaces and endow the product space $X \times Y$ with a metric $\mathrm{d}_{X\times Y}$ that satisfies

$$m_1 \max(\mathrm{d}_X, \mathrm{d}_Y) \leq \mathrm{d}_{X\times Y} \leq m_2 \max(\mathrm{d}_X, \mathrm{d}_Y) \tag{5}$$

for some $m_1, m_2 > 0$ with $m_1 \leq m_2$. Clearly the familiar product metric

$$\mathrm{d}_{X\times Y,\infty} := \max(\mathrm{d}_X, \mathrm{d}_Y)$$

satisfies (5), as do the metrics

$$\mathrm{d}_{X\times Y,p} := (\mathrm{d}_X^p + \mathrm{d}_Y^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \qquad\qquad \text{for } p \in [1,\infty)$$

with $m_1 = 1$ and $m_2 = 2^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

It is well known that if $F \subset X$ and $G \subset Y$ are two totally bounded sets then the box-counting and Assouad dimensions of their product $F \times G \subset X \times Y$ satisfy

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}(F\times G) \geq \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} G \tag{6}$$

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}}(F\times G) \leq \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} G \tag{7}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{A}}(F\times G) \leq \dim_{\mathrm{A}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{A}} G. \tag{8}$$

provided that the product metric $\mathrm{d}_{X\times Y}$ satisfies (5).

The box-counting dimension product formulae were improved in Robinson & Sharples [14] who demonstrate that product sets satisfy the chain of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} G &\leq \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} (F \times G) \\ &\leq \min\{\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} G, \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} G\} \\ &\leq \max\{\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} G, \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} G\} \\ &\leq \dim_{\mathrm{B}} (F \times G) \leq \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} G, \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

and that paper provides a method for constructing sets so that their box-counting dimensions can take arbitrary values satisfying this chain of inequalities.

We remark that if $\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F = \dim_{\mathrm{B}} F$ then it follows from (9) that there is equality in (6) and (7), so the good behaviour of just one set guarantees equality in the box-counting product formulas.

The box-counting dimension product formulae in (9) are all consequences of the geometric inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{N}\big(F \times G, m_2\delta\big) \leq \mathcal{N}(F,\delta)\mathcal{N}(G,\delta) \\ \text{and} \qquad &\mathcal{P}\left(F \times G, m_1\delta\right) \geq \mathcal{P}\left(F,\delta\right)\mathcal{P}\left(G,\delta\right),\end{aligned}$$

which in turn follow from the inclusions

$$B_{\delta/m_2}(x) \times B_{\delta/m_2}(y) \subset B_\delta((x,y)) \subset B_{\delta/m_1}(x) \times B_{\delta/m_1}(y), \qquad (10)$$

as the product of δ-ball covers of F and G gives rise to an $m_2\delta$-ball cover of $F \times G$, and the product of disjoint δ-balls with centres in F and G gives rise to a set of disjoint $m_1\delta$-balls with centres in $F \times G$ (see, for example, Falconer [4] or Robinson & Sharples [14] for further details). Combining these product inequalities with the relationships in (1) we obtain the expression

$$\mathcal{N}(F, 4\delta/m_1)\mathcal{N}(G, 4\delta/m_1) \leq \mathcal{N}(F \times G, \delta) \leq \mathcal{N}(F, \delta/m_2)\mathcal{N}(G, \delta/m_2) \qquad (11)$$

which will be useful in the remainder.

To establish the Assouad dimension product inequality we prove the following geometric relationship. One can find a very similar argument for both bounds in Olson [10] (Theorem 3.2) and for the upper bound in Robinson [13] (Lemma 9.7).

Lemma 1.5. *If $F \subset X$ and $G \subset Y$ then for all $\mathbf{x} = (x,y) \in F \times G$ and all $\delta, \rho > 0$*

$$\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(\mathbf{x}) \cap (F \times G), \rho\right) \leq \mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(x) \cap F, \rho/m_2\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(y) \cap G, \rho/m_2\right)$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(\mathbf{x}) \cap (F \times G), \rho\right) \geq \mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_2}(x) \cap F, 4\rho/m_1\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_2}(y) \cap G, 4\rho/m_1\right).$$

Proof. From (10) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&B_\delta(\mathbf{x}) \cap (F \times G) \subset \left(B_{\delta/m_1}(x) \cap F\right) \times \left(B_{\delta/m_1}(y) \cap G\right) \\ \text{and} \qquad &B_\delta(\mathbf{x}) \cap (F \times G) \supset \left(B_{\delta/m_2}(x) \cap F\right) \times \left(B_{\delta/m_2}(y) \cap G\right).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, as the function $\mathcal{N}(\cdot,\rho)$ is monotonic, it follows from (11) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(\mathbf{x})\cap(F\times G),\rho\right) &\le \mathcal{N}\left(\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(x)\cap F\right)\times\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(y)\cap G\right),\rho\right)\\ &\le \mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(x)\cap F,\rho/m_2\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(y)\cap G,\rho/m_2\right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(\mathbf{x})\cap(F\times G),\rho\right) &\ge \mathcal{N}\left(\left(B_{\delta/m_2}(x)\cap F\right)\times\left(B_{\delta/m_2}(y)\cap G\right),\rho\right)\\ &\ge \mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_2}(x)\cap F,4\rho/m_1\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_2}(y)\cap G,4\rho/m_1\right)\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

It is now simple to prove the following Assouad dimension formula for products. We remark that in Olson [10], Theorem 3.2, it was mistakenly asserted that equality holds in this product formula. However, the argument there (which we reproduce here) shows that equality *does* hold for products of the form $F\times F$.

Lemma 1.6. *If $F\subset X$ and $G\subset Y$ then*

$$\dim_A(F\times G)\le \dim_A F+\dim_A G \tag{12}$$

and

$$\dim_A(F\times F)=2\dim_A F. \tag{13}$$

Proof. Fix $\delta_0>0$. If F is an s-homogeneous set and G is a t-homogeneous set then from Lemma 1.5 it follows that for all δ,ρ with $0<\rho<\delta\le\delta_0$

$$\mathcal{N}(B_\delta(\mathbf{x})\cap(F\times G),\rho)\le \mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(x)\cap F,\rho/m_2\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(y)\cap G,\rho/m_2\right).$$

Therefore, since the sets F and G are homogeneous and $0<\rho/m_2<\delta/m_1\le\delta_0/m_1$, there exist constants $C_F,C_G>0$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}&\le C_FC_G\left(\frac{\delta/m_1}{\rho/m_2}\right)^s\left(\frac{\delta/m_1}{\rho/m_2}\right)^t\\ &\le C_FC_G\left(m_2/m_1\right)^{s+t}\left(\delta/\rho\right)^{s+t}.\end{aligned}$$

As $\delta_0>0$ was arbitrary we conclude that the set $F\times G$ is $(s+t)$-homogeneous, from which we obtain (12).

Now suppose that $F=G$. Given $\epsilon>0$, find $x\in F$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x)\cap F,\rho)\ge C(\delta/\rho)^{s-\epsilon}$$

for some $0<\rho<\delta$. Then for $\mathbf{x}=(x,x)\in F\times F$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{m_2\delta}(\mathbf{x})\cap(F\times F),m_1\rho/4\right) &\ge \mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(x)\cap F,\rho\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(x)\cap G,\rho\right)\\ &\ge C^2(\delta/\rho)^{2(s-\epsilon)};\end{aligned}$$

it follows that $\dim_A(F\times F)\ge 2(s-\epsilon)$ for every $\epsilon>0$, which yields (13). □

2 Equi-homogeneous sets

From Definition 1.3 we see that homogeneity encodes the *maximum* size of a local optimal cover at a particular length-scale. However, the *minimal* size of a local optimal cover is not captured by homogeneity, and indeed this minimum size can scale very differently, as the set described in Section 1.3 illustrates.

Example 2.1. *For each $\alpha > 0$ the set $F_\alpha := \{n^{-\alpha}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \cup \{0\}$ has Assouad dimension equal to 1, so for all $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\sup_{x\in F_\alpha} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F_\alpha, \rho)(\delta/\rho)^{-(1-\varepsilon)}$$

is unbounded on δ, ρ with $0 < \rho < \delta$.

On the other hand $1 \in F_\alpha$ is an isolated point so

$$\inf_{x\in F_\alpha} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F_\alpha, \rho) = 1$$

for all δ, ρ with $0 < \rho < \delta < 1 - 2^{-\alpha}$ as $B_\delta(1) \cap F_\alpha = \{1\}$ for such δ and this isolated point can be covered by a single ball of any radius.

For a totally bounded set the maximal and minimal sizes of local optimal covers can be estimated by more elementary quantities.

Lemma 2.2. *For a totally bounded set $F \subset X$ and δ, ρ satisfying $0 < \rho < \delta$*

$$\inf_{x\in F} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F, \rho) \leq \frac{\mathcal{N}(F,\rho)}{\mathcal{N}(F, 4\delta)} \tag{14}$$

and

$$\sup_{x\in F} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F, \rho) \geq \frac{\mathcal{N}(F,\rho)}{\mathcal{N}(F, \delta)}. \tag{15}$$

Proof. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathcal{N}(F,\delta)} \in F$ be the centers of δ-balls that form a cover of F. Clearly,

$$\mathcal{N}(F,\rho) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{N}(F,\delta)} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x_j) \cap F, \rho) \leq \mathcal{N}(F,\delta) \sup_{x\in F} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F, \rho),$$

which is (15).

Next, let δ, ρ satisfy $0 < \rho < \delta$ and let $x_1, \ldots, x_{\mathcal{P}(F,4\delta)} \in F$ be the centers of disjoint 4δ-balls. Observe that an arbitrary ρ-ball $B_\rho(z)$ intersects at most one of the balls $B_\delta(x_i)$: indeed, if there exist $x, y \in B_\rho(z)$ with $x \in B_\delta(x_i)$ and $y \in B_\delta(x_j)$ with $i \neq j$ then

$$d_X(x_i, x_j) \leq d_X(x_i, x) + d_X(x, z) + d_X(z, y) + d_X(y, x_j) \leq 2\delta + 2\rho \leq 4\delta$$

and so $x_i \in B_{4\delta}(x_j)$, which is a contradiction. Consequently, as F contains the union $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathcal{P}(F,4\delta)} B_\delta(x_j) \cap F$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}(F,\rho) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{P}(F,4\delta)} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x_j) \cap F, \rho) \\
&\geq \mathcal{P}(F, 4\delta) \inf_{x\in F} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F, \rho), \\
&\geq \mathcal{N}(F, 4\delta) \inf_{x\in F} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap F, \rho)
\end{aligned}$$

from (1), which is precisely (14). ∎

In contrast there is, in general, no similar elementary upper bound on the quantity $\sup_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x)\cap F,\rho)$, the existence of which would be useful in determining the Assouad dimension of F. For this reason we introduce the notion of equi-homogeneity. A set is equi-homogeneous if the range of the number of sets required in the local covers is uniformly bounded at all length-scales.

Definition 2.3. *We say that a set $F\subset X$ is* equi-homogeneous *if for all $\delta_0>0$ there exist constants $M\geq 1$, and $c_1,c_2>0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(x)\cap F,\rho\right)\leq M\inf_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta}(x)\cap F,c_2\rho\right) \tag{16}$$

for all δ,ρ with $0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0$.

As with the definition of the box-counting dimensions, it follows from the geometric inequalities (1) that replacing $\mathcal{N}$ with the geometric quantities $\mathcal{P}$ or $\mathcal{D}$ gives an equivalent definition of equi-homogeneity. Further, note that as $\mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x)\cap F,\rho)$ increases with δ and decreases with ρ, by replacing the c_i with 1 if necessary we can assume that $c_2\leq 1\leq c_1$ in (16). If a totally bounded set F is equi-homogeneous then, in addition to the lower bound (15), we can find an upper bound for the maximal size of the local coverings.

Corollary 2.4. *If $F\subset X$ is totally bounded and equi-homogeneous then for all $\delta_0>0$ there exist constants $M\geq 1$ and $c_1,c_2>0$ with $c_2\leq 1\leq c_1$ such that*

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}(F,\rho)}{\mathcal{N}(F,\delta)}\leq\sup_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(x)\cap F,\rho\right)\leq M\inf_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta}(x)\cap F,c_2\rho\right)\leq M\frac{\mathcal{N}\left(F,c_2\rho\right)}{\mathcal{N}\left(F,4c_1\delta\right)}$$

for all $0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0$.

Proof. Fix $\delta_0>0$. Assuming without loss of generality that (16) holds with $c_2\leq 1\leq c_1$ it is clear that $\rho<\delta$ implies $c_2\rho\leq c_1\delta$. Consequently, it follows from (14) that

$$\inf_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta}(x)\cap F,c_2\rho\right)\leq\frac{\mathcal{N}\left(F,c_2\rho\right)}{\mathcal{N}\left(F,4c_1\delta\right)}$$

for all δ,ρ with $0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0$. The remaining inequalities are immediate from the definition of equi-homogeneity and Lemma 2.2. □

In fact, with this bound we can precisely find the Assouad dimension of equi-homogeneous sets provided that their box-counting dimensions are suitably 'well behaved'.

Theorem 2.5. *If a set $F\subset X$ is equi-homogeneous, attains both its upper and lower box-counting dimensions in the sense of (3), and $\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}F=\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}}F=\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F=\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}F.$$

Proof. Fix $\delta_0>0$. As F attains both its upper and lower box-counting dimensions and these dimensions are equal it is clear from (3) that there exists a constant $C\geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C}\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F}\leq\mathcal{N}(F,\delta)\leq C\delta^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F}\qquad\text{for all } 0<\delta\leq\delta_0. \tag{17}$$

Next, as F is equi-homogeneous it follows from Corollary 2.4 that

$$\sup_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta\left(x\right)\cap F,\rho\right)\leq M\frac{\mathcal{N}\left(F,c_2\rho\right)}{\mathcal{N}\left(F,4c_1\delta\right)}\qquad\text{for all } 0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0$$

for some constants $M\geq 1$ and $c_1,c_2>0$, which from (17)

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq MC^2\frac{\left(c_2\rho\right)^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F}}{\left(4c_1\delta\right)^{-\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F}}\\&=MC^2(4c_1/c_2)^{\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F}(\delta/\rho)^{\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F}\end{aligned}$$

for all δ,ρ with $0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0$, so the set F is $(\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F)$-homogeneous. Consequently, $\dim_{\mathrm{A}}F\leq\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F$, but from (4) the Assouad dimension dominates the upper box-counting dimension so we obtain the equality $\dim_{\mathrm{A}}F=\dim_{\mathrm{B}}F$. □

The generalised Cantor sets introduced in the next section are the prototypical examples of equi-homogeneous sets, and it is precisely these sets that we use to construct examples of strict inequality in the Assouad dimension product formula. In this construction we will determine the Assouad dimension of the product of generalised Cantor sets by applying the above theorem, which first requires us to show that the product set is equi-homogeneous. However, this immediately follows from the fact that equi-homogeneity is preserved upon taking products, which we now prove.

Lemma 2.6. *If $F\subset X$ and $G\subset Y$ are equi-homogeneous and the product space $X\times Y$ is endowed with a metric satisfying* (5)*, then the product $F\times G\subset X\times Y$ is equi-homogeneous.*

Proof. Fix $\delta_0>0$. As F and G are equi-homogeneous, there exist constants $M_F,M_G\geq 1$ and $f_1,f_2,g_1,g_2>0$ such that for all $0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0/m_1$

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta\left(x\right)\cap F,\rho\right)&\leq M_F\inf_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{f_1\delta}\left(x\right)\cap F,f_2\rho\right)\\&\leq M_F\inf_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta}\left(x\right)\cap F,c_2\rho\right)\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{y\in G}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta\left(y\right)\cap G,\rho\right)&\leq M_G\inf_{y\in G}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{g_1\delta}\left(y\right)\cap G,g_2\rho\right)\\&\leq M_G\inf_{y\in G}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta}\left(y\right)\cap G,c_2\rho\right),\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

where $c_1=\max\left(f_1,g_1\right)$ and $c_2=\min\left(f_2,g_2\right)$, and the second inequalities follow from the monotonicity of $\mathcal{N}\left(\cdot,\rho\right)$ and the fact that $\mathcal{N}\left(A,\cdot\right)$ is non-increasing.

Now, from Lemma 1.5 for all $0<\rho<\delta\leq\delta_0$

$$\begin{aligned}N_{F\times G}\left(\delta,\rho\right)&:=\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in F\times G}\mathcal{N}\left(B_\delta(\mathbf{x})\cap\left(F\times G\right),\rho\right)\\&\leq\left[\sup_{x\in F}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(x)\cap F,\rho/m_2\right)\right]\left[\sup_{y\in G}\mathcal{N}\left(B_{\delta/m_1}(y)\cap G,\rho/m_2\right)\right]\end{aligned}$$

as taking suprema is submultiplicative. Since $0 < \rho/m_2 < \delta/m_1 \leq \delta_0/m_1$ it follows from (18) and (19) that $N_{F\times G}(\delta,\rho)$ is bounded above by

$$\left[M_F \inf_{x\in F} \mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta/m_1}(x)\cap F, c_2\rho/m_2\right)\right]\left[M_G \inf_{y\in G} \mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta/m_1}(y)\cap G, c_2\rho/m_2\right)\right]$$
$$\leq M_F M_G \inf_{(x,y)\in F\times G} \mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta/m_1}(x)\cap F c_2\rho/m_2\right)\mathcal{N}\left(B_{c_1\delta/m_1}(y)\cap G, c_2\rho/m_2\right),$$

as taking infima is supermultiplicative. Again applying Lemma 1.5 we obtain the upper bound

$$N_{F\times G}(\delta,\rho) \leq M_F M_G \inf_{\mathbf{x}\in F\times G} \mathcal{N}\left(B_{\frac{c_1 m_2}{m_1}\delta}(\mathbf{x})\cap(F\times G), \tfrac{c_2 m_1}{4m_2}\rho\right)$$

for all $0 < \rho < \delta \leq \delta_0$ and as $\delta_0 > 0$ was arbitrary we conclude that $F \times G$ is equi-homogeneous. □

3 Generalised Cantor Sets

A generalised Cantor set is a variation of the well known Cantor middle third set that permits the proportion removed from each interval to vary throughout the iterative process. Formally, for $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$ we define the application of the generator gen_λ to a disjoint set of compact intervals $\mathcal{I}$ as the procedure in which the open middle $1-2\lambda$ proportion of each interval is removed. It is easy to see that if $\mathcal{I}$ consists of k disjoint intervals of length L then $\mathrm{gen}_\lambda \mathcal{I}$ consists of $2k$ disjoint intervals of length λL.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence with $\lambda_i \in (0,1/2)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $C_0 = [0,1]$ and iteratively define the sets*

$$C_n := \mathrm{gen}_{\lambda_n} C_{n-1} \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The generalised Cantor set C generated from the sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is defined by

$$C := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n.$$

Observe that each intermediary set C_n consists of 2^n disjoint intervals $I_n^1, \ldots, I_n^{2^n}$ of length $L_n := \prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$, which we order by increasing left endpoint. Further, observe that the generalised Cantor set C can be written as the union of the disjoint sets $I_n^j \cap C$ for $j = 1, \ldots, 2^n$, which are identical up to a translation.

In the remainder we adopt the geometric quantity $\mathcal{D}(C,\delta)$, which we recall is the minimal cover by sets of *diameter* δ as our primary measure since it is convenient to cover generalised Cantor sets by collections of intervals of a fixed length, and this avoids the factor of $1/2$ that would occur if we used covers by δ-balls.

It is not difficult to determine that for δ in the range $L_n \leq \delta < L_{n-1}$ the minimum number of sets of diameter δ required to cover C satisfies

$$2^{n-1} \leq \mathcal{D}(C,\delta) \leq 2^n \tag{20}$$

(see, for example, [14].) From this bound we can determine the upper and lower box-counting dimensions of C from the sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let C be the generalised Cantor set generated from the sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\lambda_i \in (0, 1/2)$. The lower and upper box-counting dimensions of C satisfy*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} C = \liminf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n\log 2}{-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\lambda_i} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = \limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n\log 2}{-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\lambda_i}. \tag{22}$$

Proof. For δ in the range $L_n \le \delta < L_{n-1}$ the cover estimates (20) yield

$$\frac{(n-1)\log 2}{-\log L_n} \le \frac{\log \mathcal{D}(C,\delta)}{-\log\delta} \le \frac{n\log 2}{-\log L_{n-1}}$$

from which we derive

$$\frac{n\log 2}{-\log L_n} - \frac{\log 2}{-\log L_n} \le \frac{\log \mathcal{D}(C,\delta)}{-\log\delta} \le \frac{(n-1)\log 2}{-\log L_{n-1}} + \frac{\log 2}{-\log L_{n-1}}. \tag{23}$$

Taking limits as $\delta \to 0$, it is clear that $n \to \infty$ and $1/-\log L_n \to 0$ so taking the limit inferior of (23) we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n\log 2}{-\log L_n} \le \liminf_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{D}(C,\delta)}{-\log\delta} \le \liminf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{(n-1)\log 2}{-\log L_{n-1}} \tag{24}$$

and as the upper and lower bounds of (24) are equal we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{D}(C,\delta)}{-\log\delta} &= \liminf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n\log 2}{-\log L_n} \\ &= \liminf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n\log 2}{-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\lambda_i},\end{aligned}$$

which is precisely (21). The upper box-counting dimension equality (22) follows similarly after taking the limit superior of (23). □

This relationship is particularly pleasing as $\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\log\lambda_i} = \frac{1}{\log a_n}$ where a_n is nothing more than the geometric mean of the partial sequence $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$.

In the remainder of this section we prove that generalised Cantor sets are equi-homogeneous and use this result to determine the Assouad dimension for a certain class of generalised Cantor sets. This class includes the sets considered in Section 4 which, in particular, will have Assouad dimension strictly greater than their upper box-counting dimension.

To this end we first consider the minimal covers of subintervals of C_n. The following two properties of the sets C_n are almost immediate from the construction:

(i) for each $j = 1, \ldots, 2^n$ the subinterval I_n^j of C_n satisfies

$$\mathcal{D}(I_n^j \cap C, \rho) = \mathcal{D}(I_n^1 \cap C, \rho); \tag{25}$$

(ii) each subinterval I_{n-1} of C_{n-1} satisfies

$$\mathcal{D}(I_{n-1} \cap C, \rho) \le 2\mathcal{D}(I_n^1 \cap C, \rho) \tag{26}$$

for all ρ in the range $0 < \rho < L_{n-1}$.

For the second of these, notice that by construction $I_{n-1} \cap C = \left(I_n^i \cap C\right) \cup \left(I_n^{i+1} \cap C\right)$ for some i, and so

$$\mathcal{D}(I_{n-1} \cap C, \rho) \leq \mathcal{D}(I_n^i \cap C, \rho) + \mathcal{D}(I_n^{i+1} \cap C, \rho) = 2\mathcal{D}(I_n \cap C, \rho).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Generalised Cantor sets are equi-homogeneous.*

Proof. Let C be the generalised Cantor set generated from the sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\lambda_i \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $x \in C$ be arbitrary, and fix δ in the range $L_n \leq \delta < L_{n-1}$. As $x \in C \subset C_n$ and $\delta \geq L_n$ the ball $B_\delta(x)$ contains at least one subinterval I_n^j of C_n, so

$$I_n^j \cap C \subset B_\delta(x) \cap C. \tag{27}$$

Further, as $\delta < L_{n-1}$, the ball $B_\delta(x)$ intersects at most three subintervals of C_{n-1}, say $I_{n-1}^k, I_{n-1}^{k+1}, I_{n-1}^{k+2}$ for some k, so

$$B_\delta(x) \cap C \subset \left(I_{n-1}^k \cap C\right) \cup \left(I_{n-1}^{k+1} \cap C\right) \cup \left(I_{n-1}^{k+2} \cap C\right). \tag{28}$$

From the inclusions (27) and (28), the monotonicity and subadditivity of $\mathcal{D}(\cdot, \rho)$, and (25), we derive

$$\mathcal{D}(I_n^1 \cap C, \rho) \leq \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \leq 3\mathcal{D}(I_{n-1}^1 \cap C, \rho) \qquad \text{for all } \rho > 0 \tag{29}$$

for δ in the range $L_n \leq \delta < L_{n-1}$. Restricting ρ to the range $0 < \rho < \delta < L_{n-1}$ we apply (26) to conclude that

$$\mathcal{D}(I_n^1 \cap C, \rho) \leq \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \leq 6\mathcal{D}(I_n^1 \cap C, \rho)$$

for all δ in the range $L_n \leq \delta < L_{n-1}$, all ρ in the range $0 < \rho < \delta$ and all $x \in C$. Consequently,

$$\sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \leq 6 \inf_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \tag{30}$$

for all δ, ρ satisfying $0 < \rho < \delta$ so we conclude that C is equi-homogeneous. □

Generalised Cantor sets, therefore, satisfy the hypotheses of Corollary 2.4. We will use this fact in the following lemmas to find bounds on the Assouad dimension for a particular class of generalised Cantor sets, which will be useful in the remainder.

Lemma 3.4. *If there exists a λ such that $\lambda_i \leq \lambda$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ then* $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C \leq -\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}$.

Proof. If $\lambda \geq 1/2$ then there is nothing to prove as trivially $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C \leq 1$, so assume $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$. Consider δ, ρ with $\rho < \delta$ in the ranges $L_n \leq \delta < L_{n-1}$ and $L_{n+m} \leq \rho < L_{n+m-1}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Observe that for $m \geq 2$

$$\delta/\rho \geq L_n/L_{n+m-1} = \prod_{i=n+1}^{n+m-1} \lambda_i^{-1} \geq \lambda^{-(m-1)}, \tag{31}$$

which, as $\delta/\rho > 1$, also holds when $m = 0, 1$. Now, it follows from (31) and the cover estimates (20) that the ratio

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}(C,\rho)}{\mathcal{D}(C,\delta)} \leq \frac{2^{n+m}}{2^{m-1}} = 4 \cdot 2^{m-1} = 4\left(\lambda^{-(1-m)}\right)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}} \leq 4\,(\delta/\rho)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}}, \qquad (32)$$

which, as n and m were arbitrary, holds for all δ, ρ with $0 < \rho < \delta$.

Next, as C is equi-homogeneous it follows from Corollary 2.4 and the geometric inequalities (1) that for all $\delta_0 > 0$ there exist constants $M \geq 1$, and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ with $c_2 \leq 1 \leq c_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \leq \sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{N}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho/2) &\leq M \frac{\mathcal{N}(C, c_2\rho/2)}{\mathcal{N}(C, 4c_1\delta)} \\ &\leq M \frac{\mathcal{D}(C, c_2\rho/4)}{\mathcal{D}(C, 8c_1\delta)}\end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \rho < \delta \leq \delta_0$. As $\rho < \delta$ implies that $c_2\rho/4 < 8c_1\delta$ it follows from (32) that

$$\sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \leq M4\,(8c_1\delta/(c_2\rho/4))^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}} = 4M\,(32c_1/c_2)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}}\,(\delta/\rho)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}}$$

for all δ, ρ with $0 < \rho < \delta \leq \delta_0$. This is precisely the claim that the generalised Cantor set C is $(-\log 2/\log \lambda)$-homogeneous, so we conclude that $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C \leq -\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}$. □

We can also obtain a similar lower bound.

Lemma 3.5. *If there exists a $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$ and a sequence $\{j_m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the m consecutive generators $\lambda_{j_m+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{j_m+m} \geq \lambda$ then $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C \geq -\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and suppose for a contradiction that there exist $\delta_0, \eta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}(B_\delta(x) \cap C, \rho) \leq \eta\,(\delta/\rho)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log \lambda}-\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < \rho < \delta \leq \delta_0. \qquad (33)$$

First observe that from Lemma 2.2 and the geometric inequalities (1) we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}(B_{2\delta}(x) \cap C, \rho/4) \geq \sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{N}(B_{2\delta}(x) \cap C, \rho/2) &\geq \frac{\mathcal{N}(C, \rho/2)}{\mathcal{N}(C, 2\delta)} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathcal{D}(C, \rho)}{\mathcal{D}(C, \delta)} \qquad (34)\end{aligned}$$

for δ, ρ with $0 < \rho < \delta$.

Now, let $\delta_m = L_{j_m}$ and $\rho_m = L_{j_m+m}$, and observe that $\rho_m < \delta_m$ for all m, and that $\delta_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Moreover,

$$\delta_m/\rho_m = L_{j_m}/L_{j_m+m} = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_{j_m+i}^{-1} \leq \lambda^{-m} \qquad (35)$$

by assumption and similarly $\delta_m/\rho_m \geq 2^m$ as $\lambda_i < 1/2$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from (34) and the cover estimates (20) that

$$\sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}\left(B_{2\delta_m}(x) \cap C, \rho_m/4\right) \geq \frac{\mathcal{D}(C,\rho_m)}{\mathcal{D}(C,\delta_m)} \geq \frac{2^{j_m+m-1}}{2^{j_m}} = \frac{1}{2}2^m = \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda^{-m}\right)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log\lambda}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta_m/\rho_m\right)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log\lambda}} \tag{36}$$

from (35). Consequently, with the assumption (33) it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\delta_m/\rho_m\right)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log\lambda}} \leq \sup_{x\in C} \mathcal{D}\left(B_{2\delta_m}(x) \cap C, \rho_m/4\right) \leq \eta\left(2\delta_m/\left(\rho_m/4\right)\right)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log\lambda}-\varepsilon}$$

for m sufficiently large that $2\delta_m < \delta_0$. Rearranging, and recalling that $\delta_m/\rho_m \geq 2^m$, we obtain

$$2^m \leq \delta_m/\rho_m \leq \left(2\eta 8^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log\lambda}-\varepsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}$$

for all m sufficiently large, which is a contradiction.

We conclude that C is not $(-\log 2/\log\lambda - \varepsilon)$-homogeneous for any $\varepsilon > 0$, so $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C \geq -\frac{\log 2}{\log\lambda}$. □

4 Strict inequality in the two product formulae

In this section we provide a method for constructing two generalised Cantor sets C and D so that the Assouad dimensions of these sets and their product satisfy

$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = \dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C \times D) = \alpha$$

for $\alpha \in (0,1)$. In particular for these sets the Assouad dimension product inequality (8) is strict and maximal in the sense that the sum $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D$ takes the maximal value $2\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C \times D)$.

This task is significantly simplified using the results of the previous sections that relate the Assouad dimension to the more manageable box-counting dimensions. In essence we construct these sets so that the significant length-scales are common to both sets, which is similar in approach to the compatible generalised Cantor sets of Robinson and Sharples [14].

Let $q \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and let $a = \{a_i\}$ be a sequence of positive integers. We define two generalised Cantor sets C and D via the respective sequences $\{\lambda_i\}$ and $\{\mu_i\}$ defined by

$$\lambda_i := \begin{cases} q^{a_{2k}+1} & i = n_k \quad \text{for some } k \in \mathbb{N} \\ q & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_i := \begin{cases} q^{a_{2k+1}+1} & i = m_k \quad \text{for some } k \in \mathbb{N} \\ q & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $n_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j-1}$ and $m_k = a_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j}$. For brevity we say that the pair of sets (C, D) is generated by (q, a), and we denote the partial sum

$s_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i$. Essentially, the sequences of generators λ_i and μ_i are chosen so that, when δ is restricted to the range $[q^{s_{k+1}}, q^{s_k}]$, one of the functions $\mathcal{D}(C,\delta)$ or $\mathcal{D}(D,\delta)$ scales like $\delta^{-\log 2/\log q}$ while the other is essentially constant, and such that these roles alternate as k increases. While the growth of the individual functions $\mathcal{D}(C,\delta)$ and $\mathcal{D}(D,\delta)$ fluctuates with δ, the product $\mathcal{D}(C,\delta)\mathcal{D}(D,\delta)$ scales like $\delta^{-\log 2/\log q}$ for all δ.

Theorem 4.1. *Let the pair of generalised Cantor sets C and D be generated by (q,a). For all $\delta_0 > 0$ there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\eta^{-1}\delta^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log q}} \le \mathcal{D}(C\times D,\delta) \le \eta\,\delta^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log q}} \qquad \text{for all } 0<\delta<\delta_0, \tag{37}$$

so that in particular

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}(C\times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C\times D) = \dim_A(C\times D) = -\log 2/\log q.$$

Proof. Using the terminology of the previous section, the intermediary sets C_n and D_n consist of 2^n intervals of length $L_n := \prod_{i=1}^{n}\lambda_i$ and $M_n := \prod_{i=1}^{n}\mu_i$ respectively.

We first consider the generalised Cantor set C. For $n\in\mathbb{N}$ in the range $n_k \le n < n_{k+1}$ all except k of the $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n$ are equal to q, so

$$L_n = q^{n-k}\prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{a_{2i}+1} = q^n \prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{a_{2i}}.$$

Taking logarithms for clarity, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log L_n}{\log q} &= n-k+\sum_{i=1}^{k}(a_{2i}+1) = n+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_{2i}\\ &= n-\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_{2i-1}+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_{2i-1}+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_{2i} = n-n_k+s_{2k},\end{aligned}$$

so

$$L_n = q^{n-n_k+s_{2k}}, \qquad n_k \le n < n_{k+1}, \tag{38}$$

and, in particular, $L_{n_k} = q^{s_{2k}}$ and $L_{n_{k+1}-1} = q^{s_{2k+1}-1}$. Observe that for $n_k \le n < n_{k+1}$ the length L_n has range $\left[L_{n_{k+1}-1}, L_{n_k}\right] = \left[q^{s_{2k+1}-1}, q^{s_{2k}}\right]$, so inverting the relationship (38), we derive

$$q^j = L_{n_k+j-s_{2k}}, \qquad s_{2k} \le j \le s_{2k+1}-1,$$

so, from the cover estimates (20),

$$2^{n_k+j-s_{2k}-1} \le \mathcal{D}(C,q^j) \le 2^{n_k+j-s_{2k}}, \qquad s_{2k} \le j \le, s_{2k+1}-1. \tag{39}$$

Further, observe that (38) yields $L_{n_{k+1}} = q^{s_{2k+2}}$ and $L_{n_{k+1}-1} = q^{s_{2k+1}-1}$, so

$$L_{n_{k+1}} \le q^j \le L_{n_{k+1}-1}, \qquad s_{2k+1}-1 \le j \le s_{2k+2},$$

from which, with the cover estimates (20), we conclude that

$$2^{n_{k+1}-2} \leq \mathcal{D}(C, q^j) \leq 2^{n_{k+1}}, \qquad s_{2k+1} - 1 \leq j \leq, s_{2k+2}. \tag{40}$$

A very similar argument shows that for the set D the bounds

$$2^{m_k+j-s_{2k+1}-1} \leq \mathcal{D}(D, q^j) \leq 2^{m_k+j-s_{2k+1}}, \qquad s_{2k+1} \leq j \leq s_{2k+2} - 1. \tag{41}$$

and

$$2^{m_k-2} \leq \mathcal{D}(D, q^j) \leq 2^{m_k}, \qquad s_{2k} - 1 \leq j \leq s_{2k+1}. \tag{42}$$

hold.

Now, taking the product of (40) and (41) we obtain

$$2^{n_{k+1}+m_k+j-s_{2k+1}-3} \leq \mathcal{D}(C, q^j)\mathcal{D}(D, q^j) \leq 2^{n_{k+1}+m_k+j-s_{2k+1}} \tag{43}$$

for $s_{2k+1} \leq j \leq s_{2k+2} - 1$, and multiplying (39) with (42) yields

$$2^{n_k+m_k+j-s_{2k}-3} \leq \mathcal{D}(C, q^j)\mathcal{D}(D, q^j) \leq 2^{n_k+m_k+j-s_{2k}} \tag{44}$$

for $s_{2k} \leq j \leq s_{2k+1} - 1$. Finally, since $n_k + m_k = s_{2k} + a_1$ and $n_{k+1} + m_k = s_{2k+1} + a_1$, the bounds (43) and (44) are precisely

$$2^{j+a_1-3} \leq \mathcal{D}(C, q^j)\mathcal{D}(D, q^j) \leq 2^{j+a_1} \tag{45}$$

for $s_{2k} \leq j \leq s_{2k+2} - 1$ and, as $k \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary, we see that (45) holds for all $j \geq s_2$. It follows that

$$2^{a_1-3}\delta^{\frac{\log 2}{\log q}} \leq \mathcal{D}(C, \delta)\mathcal{D}(D, \delta) \leq 2^{a_1}\delta^{\frac{\log 2}{\log q}}, \qquad \text{for all } 0 < \delta < q^{s_2}.$$

Finally, recall from the product inequality (11) and the geometric relationships (1) that for all $\delta > 0$

$$\mathcal{D}(C, 8\delta)\mathcal{D}(D, 8\delta) \leq \mathcal{D}(C \times D, \delta) \leq \mathcal{D}(C, \delta/2\sqrt{2})\mathcal{D}(D, \delta/2\sqrt{2}),$$

whence

$$\eta^{-1}\delta^{\frac{\log 2}{\log q}} \leq \mathcal{D}(C \times D, \delta) \leq \eta\delta^{\frac{\log 2}{\log q}}, \qquad \text{for all } 0 < \delta < q^{s_2}. \tag{46}$$

If $\delta_0 < q^{s_2}$ then (46) implies (37), otherwise observe that for δ in the range $q^{s_2} \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$ trivially

$$\mathcal{D}\left(C \times D, \delta_0\right)\left(q^{s_2}\right)^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log q}}\delta^{\frac{\log 2}{\log q}} \leq \mathcal{D}\left(C \times D, \delta\right) \leq \mathcal{D}\left(C \times D, q^{s_2}\right)\delta_0^{-\frac{\log 2}{\log q}}\delta^{\frac{\log 2}{\log q}}$$

which, together with (46), yields (37).

This immediately shows that the upper and lower box-counting dimensions coincide, are attained, and are equal to $-\log 2/\log q$. The same expression for the Assouad dimension then follows using Theorem 2.5 and the fact that the product set $C \times D$ is equi-homongeneous, being the product of two equi-homogeneous sets C and D (Lemmas 2.6 and 3.3). □

Theorem 4.2. *Let the pair of generalised Cantor sets C and D be generated by (q, a). The upper box-counting dimensions of C and D are given by*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} a_i} \tag{47}$$

and $$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} D = -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k} a_i}$$

respectively.

Proof. Recall from Lemma 3.2 that the upper-box counting dimensions of C and D are given by

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = \limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n \log 2}{-\log L_n} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D = \limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n \log 2}{-\log M_n}.$$

We first consider the generalised Cantor set C. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ in the range $n_k \leq n < n_{k+1}$ we obtain from (38)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n \log 2}{-\log L_n} = \frac{n \log 2}{-(n - n_k + s_{2k}) \log q} &\leq -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \frac{n_{k+1}}{s_{2k+1}} \\ &= -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $n/(a+n)$ is increasing in n for $a > 0$. Taking the limit superior as n (and hence k) tend to infinity we conclude that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C \leq -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i},$$

which is the upper bound in (47). To establish the lower bound we consider the subsequence $n_{k+1} - 1$ and recall from (38) that $L_{n_{k+1}-1} = q^{s_{2k+1}-1}$. Consequently,

$$\frac{(n_{k+1}-1)\log 2}{-\log L_{n_{k+1}-1}} = \frac{(n_{k+1}-1)\log 2}{-(s_{2k+1}-1)\log q} = -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} a_{2j-1} - 1}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i - 1},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = \limsup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{n \log 2}{-\log L_n} &\geq \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{(n_{k+1}-1)\log 2}{-\log L_{n_{k+1}-1}} \\ &= -\left(\frac{\log 2}{\log q}\right) \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i}.\end{aligned}$$

Since these upper and lower bounds coincide we obtain the equality in (47).

The argument for D follows similar lines. □

In general the Assouad dimension dominates the upper box-counting dimension, so the above theorem provides lower bounds for the Assouad dimension of the sets C and D. However, using the results of the previous section, we can precisely determine the Assouad dimension of the sets C and D provided that the odd and even terms of the sequence $\{a_i\}$ respectively are unbounded.

Theorem 4.3. *If the generalised Cantor sets (C, D) are generated by (q, a) then*

$$\sup\{a_{2i-i}\} = \infty \qquad \textit{implies} \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = -\tfrac{\log 2}{\log q},$$
$$\textit{and} \qquad \sup\{a_{2i}\} = \infty \qquad \textit{implies} \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = -\tfrac{\log 2}{\log q}.$$

Proof. If the sequence a_{2j-1} is unbounded then there exists a subsequence a_{2j_k-1} such that $a_{2j_k-1} > k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $n_{j_k-1} + k < n_{j_k-1} + a_{2j_k-1} = n_{j_k}$, so from the definition of the λ_i we conclude that the k consecutive generators

$$\lambda_i = q \quad \text{for} \quad i = n_{j_k-1} + 1, \ldots, n_{j_k-1} + k.$$

It follows from Lemma 3.5 that $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C \geq -\log 2/\log q$. The opposite inequality follows from Lemma 3.4 as $\lambda_i \leq q$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, so we conclude that $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = -\log 2/\log q$. The argument for the set D follows similar lines. □

In summary we have constructed generalised Cantor sets C and D such that

$$\dim_B C = -\frac{\log 2}{\log q} \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i},$$
$$\dim_B D = -\frac{\log 2}{\log q} \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} a_{2j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+2} a_i},$$
$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C \times D) = \dim_B(C \times D) = -\frac{\log 2}{\log q},$$
$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = -\frac{\log 2}{\log q} \qquad \text{if } \{a_{2i-1}\} \text{ is unbounded,}$$
$$\text{and} \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = -\frac{\log 2}{\log q} \qquad \text{if } \{a_{2i}\} \text{ is unbounded.}$$

By choosing the $\{a_i\}$ appropriately we can now produce generalised Cantor sets C and D such that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = \dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C \times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C \times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{LB}}(C \times D),$$

where the box-counting dimensions of these sets take arbitrary values satisfying the product formula

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C, \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D \leq \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C \times D) \leq \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D,$$

subject to the restrictions that

$$0 < \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C, \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D < \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C \times D) < 1. \tag{48}$$

In particular the Assouad dimension of the product satisfies

$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C \times D) < \dim_{\mathrm{A}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = 2\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C \times D)$$

so there is a strict inequality in the Assouad dimension product formula (8). Further, these sets give extreme examples of strict inequality in the product formula as, in general, $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} F + \dim_{\mathrm{A}} G \leq 2\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(F \times G)$ for arbitrary sets F, G.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$. There exist generalised Cantor sets C and D such that*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = \alpha\beta, \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} D = \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D = \alpha\left(1-\beta\right),$$

and

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}\left(C \times D\right) = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}\left(C \times D\right) = \dim_{\mathrm{A}}\left(C \times D\right) = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = \alpha.$$

Proof. Define the sequence $a = \{a_i\}$ by $a_{2k-1} = \lceil \beta k \rceil$ and $a_{2k} = \lceil (1-\beta)\, k \rceil$ where the ceiling function $\lceil x \rceil$ is the smallest integer greater than or equal to x. Clearly $\beta, 1-\beta > 0$ so the a_i are positive integers. Let the pair of generalised Cantor sets C and D be generated by $\left(2^{-1/\alpha}, a\right)$, so immediately from Theorem 4.1 we obtain

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}\left(C \times D\right) = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}\left(C \times D\right) = \dim_{\mathrm{A}}\left(C \times D\right) = \alpha$$

as required. Further, as both the odd and even terms a_{2i-1} and a_{2i} are unbounded we obtain $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = \alpha$ from Theorem 4.3.

Next, observe that

$$\tfrac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\left(1-\beta\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j} \leq \tfrac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\left(1-\beta\right) + k$$

$$\text{and} \qquad \tfrac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\beta \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j-1} \leq \tfrac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\beta + k.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} a_i} &\leq \frac{\frac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\beta + k}{\frac{1}{2}k\left(k-1\right)\left(1-\beta\right) + \frac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\beta} \\ &= \frac{\left(k+1\right)\beta + 2}{k - 1 + 2\beta} \to \beta\end{aligned}$$

as $k \to \infty$, while

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} a_i} &\geq \frac{\frac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\beta}{\frac{1}{2}k\left(k-1\right)\left(1-\beta\right) + k - 1 + \frac{1}{2}k\left(k+1\right)\beta + k} \\ &= \frac{k\left(k+1\right)\beta}{k^2 + k - 1 + 2k\beta} \to \beta\end{aligned}$$

as $k \to \infty$. It follows from Theorem 4.2 that $\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = \alpha\beta$ as required, and from a similar argument we obtain $\dim_{\mathrm{B}} D = \alpha\left(1-\beta\right)$. Finally, observe that from the chain of product inequalities (9) we obtain

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D = \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} D = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}\left(C \times D\right),$$

which implies that $\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} C = \alpha\beta$ and $\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} D = \alpha\left(1-\beta\right)$. □

The previous lemma is a limiting case of the following more general construction, which gives independent control over the box-counting dimensions of C and D.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in (0,1)$ be such that $\beta+\gamma > 1$. There exist generalised Cantor sets C and D such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} C &= \alpha(1-\gamma), & \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C &= \alpha\beta, \\ \dim_{\mathrm{LB}} D &= \alpha(1-\beta), & \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D &= \alpha\gamma, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}(C\times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C\times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C\times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = \alpha.$$

Proof. We first observe that $\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}, \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} > 0$ and that

$$\frac{\gamma\beta}{(1-\gamma)(1-\beta)} > 1 \tag{49}$$

follows from $\beta+\gamma>1$.

Now recursively define the sequence $\{a_i\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= 1, \\ a_2 &= \left\lceil \tfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \right\rceil + 1, \\ a_{2k+1} &= \left\lceil \tfrac{\beta}{1-\beta} e_k - o_k \right\rceil + 1, && (50) \\ \text{and} \qquad a_{2k+2} &= \left\lceil \tfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} o_{k+1} - e_k \right\rceil + 1 && (51) \end{aligned}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $o_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j-1}$ and $e_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{2j}$ are the sums of the odd and of the even terms of a_i respectively. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2k+2} \geq \tfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} o_{k+1} - e_k + 1 &= \tfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}(a_{2k+1} + o_k) - e_k + 1 \\ &\geq \tfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma}\left(\tfrac{\beta}{1-\beta} e_k + 1\right) - e_k \\ &= \left(\tfrac{\gamma\beta}{(1-\gamma)(1-\beta)} - 1\right) e_k + \tfrac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$a_{2k+3} \geq \left(\tfrac{\gamma\beta}{(1-\gamma)(1-\beta)}\right) o_{k+1} + \tfrac{\beta}{1-\beta},$$

from which, with (49), a straightforward inductive argument shows that the a_i are positive integers with unbounded odd and even terms.

Now, let the pair of generalised Cantor sets (C, D) be generated from $\left(2^{-1/\alpha}, a\right)$. From Theorem 4.1 we obtain

$$\dim_{\mathrm{LB}}(C\times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C\times D) = \dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C\times D) = \alpha$$

and from Theorem 4.3 that $\dim_{\mathrm{A}} C = \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D = \alpha$ as required. Further, from Theorem 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C &= \alpha \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_{2j-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} a_i} \\ &= \alpha \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{o_{k+1}}{o_{k+1}+e_k} = \alpha \limsup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{1+\frac{e_k}{o_{k+1}}} \end{aligned}$$

and from (50) it follows that

$$\frac{1-\beta}{\beta}\frac{e_k}{e_k+2\frac{1-\beta}{\beta}} \le \frac{e_k}{o_{k+1}} \le \frac{1-\beta}{\beta}\frac{e_k}{e_k+\frac{1-\beta}{\beta}},$$

so we conclude that $\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C = \alpha\beta$. A similar argument using (51) shows that $\dim_{\mathrm{B}} D = \alpha\gamma$. As in Lemma 4.4 the lower box-counting dimensions are obtained from the chain of dimension inequalities (9). □

In conclusion we have demonstrated that the class of generalised Cantor sets include natural, elementary examples of sets for which the Assouad dimension product inequality is strict and maximal in the sense that the upper bound

$$\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C\times D) \le \dim_{\mathrm{A}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{A}} D \le 2\dim_{\mathrm{A}}(C\times D)$$

is actually an equality. Further, inside this class of sets are examples that, in addition, have box-counting dimensions with arbitrary values satisfying

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}} C, \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D \le \dim_{\mathrm{B}}(C\times D) \le \dim_{\mathrm{B}} C + \dim_{\mathrm{B}} D,$$

subject to the restrictions (48).

A Box-counting dimensions of self-products

The following product dimension equality is interesting, particularly in the light of the parallel result for the Assouad dimension presented here in Lemma 1.6. However, since it falls outside the main scope of this paper we give it in this brief appendix.

Lemma A.1. *Let (X,d_X) be a metric space and equip the product space $X\times X$ with a metric satisfying* (5)*. For all totally bounded sets $F\subset X$*

$$\dim_{\mathrm{B}}(F\times F) = 2\dim_{\mathrm{B}} F$$
$$\textit{and} \qquad \dim_{\mathrm{LB}}(F\times F) = 2\dim_{\mathrm{LB}} F.$$

Proof. Let $F, G\subset X$ be totally bounded sets. Recall from (11) that for all $\delta>0$

$$\mathcal{N}(F,4\delta/m_1)\mathcal{N}(G,4\delta/m_1) \le \mathcal{N}(F\times G,\delta) \le \mathcal{N}(F,\delta/m_2)\mathcal{N}(G,\delta/m_2)$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log\mathcal{N}(F\times G,\delta)}{-\log\delta} &\le \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(F,\delta/m_2)}{-\log\delta} + \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(G,\delta/m_2)}{-\log\delta}\\ &= \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(F,\delta/m_2)}{-\log(\delta/m_2)+\log(m_2)} + \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(G,\delta/m_2)}{-\log(\delta/m_2)+\log(m_2)}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log\mathcal{N}(F\times G,\delta)}{-\log\delta} &\ge \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(F,4\delta/m_1)}{-\log\delta} + \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(G,4\delta/m_1)}{-\log\delta}\\ &= \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(F,4\delta/m_1)}{-\log(4\delta/m_1)+\log(m_1/4)} + \frac{\log\mathcal{N}(G,4\delta/m_1\delta)}{-\log(4\delta/m_1)+\log(m_1/4)}.\end{aligned}$$

These upper and lower bounds have the same limit superior and the same limit inferior as $\delta \to 0+$, so we obtain

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F\times G,\delta)}{-\log\delta} = \limsup_{\delta\to 0+}\left(\frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F,\delta)}{-\log\delta} + \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(G,\delta)}{-\log\delta}\right) \quad (52)$$

and

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F\times G,\delta)}{-\log\delta} = \liminf_{\delta\to 0+}\left(\frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F,\delta)}{-\log\delta} + \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(G,\delta)}{-\log\delta}\right). \quad (53)$$

Consequently, in the case $F = G$

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F\times F,\delta)}{-\log\delta} = 2\limsup_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F,\delta)}{-\log\delta}$$

and

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F\times F,\delta)}{-\log\delta} = 2\liminf_{\delta\to 0+} \frac{\log \mathcal{N}(F,\delta)}{-\log\delta}.$$

□

We remark that the general box-counting dimension product inequalities follow from (52) and (53) and the fact that taking limits superior is subadditive whilst taking limits inferior is superadditive.

References

[1] Patrice Assouad. Étude d'une dimension métrique liéea la possibilité de plongements dans $\mathbb{R}^n$. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 288:A731–A734, 1979.

[2] Abram S Besicovitch and PAP Moran. The measure of product and cylinder sets. *J. Lond. Math. Soc*, 20:110–120, 1945.

[3] Georges Bouligand. Ensembles impropres et nombre dimensionnels. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 52:320–344, 1928.

[4] Kenneth J Falconer. *Fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, England, second edition, 2003.

[5] Jonathan Fraser. Assouad type dimensions and homogeneity of fractals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2014. (To appear.).

[6] Alexander M Henderson, Eric J Olson, James C Robinson, and Nicholas Sharples. Equi-homogeneity, Assouad dimension and non-autonomous dynamics. (Submitted).

[7] John D Howroyd. On dimension and on the existence of sets of finite positive Hausdorff measure. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, s3-70(3):581–604, 1995.

[8] DG Larman. A new theory of dimension. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, s3-17(1):178–192, 1967.

[9] Jouni Luukkainen. Assouad dimension: antifractal metrization, porous sets, and homogeneous measures. *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, 35(1):23–76, 1998.

[10] Eric J Olson. Bouligand dimension and almost Lipschitz embeddings. *Pacific J. Math.*, 202(2):459–474, 2002.

[11] Eric J Olson and James C Robinson. A simple example concerning the upper box-counting dimension of a Cartesian product. *Real Anal. Exchange*, 2014. (To appear.).

[12] James C Robinson. *Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems: an introduction to dissipative parabolic PDEs and the theory of global attractors*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[13] James C Robinson. *Dimensions, embeddings, and attractors*. Number 186 in Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[14] James C Robinson and Nicholas Sharples. Strict inequality in the box-counting dimension product formulas. *Real Anal. Exchange*, 38(1):95–119, 2013.